

Remarks

The non-final Office Action dated April 8, 2008, indicated that: the drawings stand objected to; claims 1-24 stand objected to; claims 1, 2 and 4-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Hartnett (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,217); and claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the '217 reference in view of Schwarz (US Patent No. 6,496,947). Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is requested in light of the arguments presented below; Applicant does not acquiesce explicitly to any rejection or averment in this Office Action unless expressly indicated otherwise.

Applicant submits that the objections to the drawings are no longer applicable in view of the replacement drawing sheet for FIG. 1, which shows hatched lines, corresponding to shading, which appears to have been lost. This replacement sheet is consistent with the application as filed (and, *e.g.*, with the foreign priority document for the instant application).

Applicant respectfully traverses the objections to the claims because the claim terms upon which the objections are based are appropriate under relevant law, and further because the Office Action has not set forth any legal rationale for the objections. However, Applicant has amended the claims to facilitate prosecution, in a manner that removes the claim terms upon which the objections are based, and believes that the claim objections are thus no longer applicable. Applicant believes that the amendments made to address various informalities and to improve readability are not made in view of any art or necessary for patentability.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(b) rejections because the rejections fail to show correspondence to each of the claim limitations. Referring to page 4 of the Office Action, the rejections of each of independent claims 1, 20 and 23 cite to an integrated circuit 200, TAP controller 231 and LUT 201 components of FIG. 2 in the '217 reference, but these citations are confusing and fail to allege correspondence to the limitations as claimed. For example, the Office Action cites to "a semiconductor device (integrated circuit 200) comprising an IEEE 1149 TAP controller 231, such as an integral characterization unit." Reviewing claim 1 of the instant application, it appears that the Office Action is asserting that the "semiconductor device (integrated circuit 200) comprising an IEEE 1149 TAP controller 231" corresponds to the claimed

“semiconductor device comprising a functional device” (*i.e.*, that the TAP controller 231 is the claimed functional device). However, this rejection is confusing because the Office Action goes on to call the LUT 201 the claimed functional device. Thus, it is unclear as to what structures in the ‘217 reference are being asserted against the claim limitations. Moreover, applicant has reviewed the cited portions of FIG. 2 (200, 231 and 201) and cannot ascertain any “functional device characterized by an integral characterization unit” as claimed.

The rejections of all of the dependent claims 2, 4-19 and 24 similarly lack clarity and fail to provide direct correspondence to each claim limitation. The rejections are set forth in two paragraphs at pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, which cite to portions of FIG. 2 in the ‘217 reference but fail to allege correspondence to each of the limitations in the dependent claims. Generally, these two paragraphs, which are relied upon in rejecting eighteen claims, are confusing and fail to establish which cited portions of the ‘217 reference allegedly correspond to which claims, and to which limitations in those claims. As with the rejections of the independent claims above, Applicant is unable to ascertain the nature of the rejection and provide a response thereto.

In view of the above the Section 102 rejections are improper for failing to show correspondence to all claim limitations, and for failing to state the rejection in a manner that apprises the Applicant of the nature of the rejection (to allow the Applicant to respond thereto, consistent with 35 U.S.C. §132). Applicant therefore requests that the rejections be removed.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103 rejection of claim 3 for reasons including those stated above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, and further because the cited combination of references fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations. Specifically, the cited BIST circuit 18 does not control the voltage regulator circuit 502 in the ‘947 reference as asserted in the Office Action. Rather, as shown in FIG. 7 and discussed in the corresponding portions of the ‘947 reference, the voltage regulator circuit 502 provides a control signal to the BIST circuit 18. In this regard, the asserted operation of the ‘947 reference is incorrect and the rejection thus fails to provide correspondence to the claimed invention. Applicant

therefore submits that the Section 103 rejections are also improper, and requests that they be removed.

Applicant has amended the claims in a manner that is believed to be consistent with the claims as filed, and is consistent with example embodiments described in the specification. In view of the above discussion, Applicant believes that the amendments are not necessary to overcome any of the above-discussed prior art rejections. Applicant further submits that the cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations in the amended claims. For example, the cited references fails to disclose an integral characterization unit that is responsive to external interface inputs, for controlling a functional device that is responsive to separate test stimuli. The cited references also fail to disclose the internal characterization (*e.g.*, as with a Schmoor plot) of a device under test. Support for the claim amendments and/or the new claims may be found, for example, in figures 2-4 and corresponding discussion.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that each of the objections and rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheet

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.529PA)